CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT CO  OCT - 4 2013  CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALL	

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA WESTERN DIVISION

GAG PROPERTIES,

Plaintiff,

ORDER SUMMARILY REMANDING

IMPROPERLY-REMOVED ACTION

Defendant.

Defendant.

The Court will remand this "Complaint for Unlawful Detainer - Amount Demanded Does Not Exceed \$10,000," Case No. 13 U10485, to state court summarily because Defendant removed it improperly.

On September 24, 2013, Defendant John Taylor, who is not a named party in what appears to be a routine unlawful detainer action in California state court, lodged a Notice Of Removal of that action to this Court and also presented an application to proceed in forma pauperis. The Court has denied the latter applications under separate cover because the action was not properly removed. To prevent the action from remaining in jurisdictional limbo, the Court issues this Order to remand the action to state court.

## Case 2:13-cv-07073-UA-DUTY Document 3 Filed 10/04/13 Page 2 of 2 Page ID #:29

Simply stated, Plaintiff could not have brought this action in federal court in the first place, in that Defendant does not competently allege facts supplying either diversity or federal-question jurisdiction, and therefore removal is improper. 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a); see Exxon Mobil Corp v. Allapattah Svcs., Inc., 545 U.S. 546, 563 (2005). Even if complete diversity of citizenship exists, the amount in controversy does not exceed the diversity-jurisdiction threshold of \$75,000. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332, 1441(b). On the contrary, the unlawful-detainer complaint recites that the amount in controversy does not exceed \$10,000.

Nor does Plaintiff's unlawful detainer action raise any federal legal question. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1441(b).

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that (1) this matter be REMANDED to the Superior Court of California, Los Angeles County, 111 North Hill Street, Los Angeles, California 90012 for lack of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c); (2) that the Clerk send a certified copy of this Order to the state court; and (3) that the Clerk serve copies of this Order on the parties.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 10/2/13

HONORABLE GEORGE H. KING CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE